



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/759,112

01/20/2004

Ernst Affeldt

038741:53144US

6929

23911 7590 07/23/2007  
CROWELL & MORING LLP  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP  
P.O. BOX 14300  
WASHINGTON, DC 20044-4300

EXAMINER

AUSTIN, AARON

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1775

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/23/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 10/759,112	Applicant(s) AFFELDT ET AL.	
	Examiner Aaron S. Austin	Art Unit 1775	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 June 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29, 31-46 and 48-59 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29, 31-46 and 48-59 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>20070604</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Murphy (US Patent No. 5,716,720).

Murphy teaches a thermal barrier protected nickel based superalloy for use with gas turbine engine components including turbine blades (column 1, line 11). The platinum modified diffusion aluminide barrier is formed by depositing a layer of platinum on the substrate and chemical vapor depositing aluminum on the platinum covered substrate under high temperature and low activity conditions to form a diffusion zone (column 2, lines 45-51). The region of diffusion is a beta NiAl region (column 2, lines 24-27). The amount of aluminum used is about 18 to 26wt% and the amount of platinum is in the range of 8 to 35wt% (column 2, lines 32-36). Both "less than 18 wt%" and a value of 17.99 wt% overlap with "about 18" wt%.

Claims 1-3, 8-12, 16-18, 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rose et al. (US Patent No. 5,482,578), Rose et al. (US Patent No. 5,492,726), or Rose et al. (US Patent No. 5,843,588).

The prior art references teach a coating and process for its application to substrates such as beta NiAl turbine blades (column 2, line 6 and column 4, line 15 of Rose '578). The coating is formed by application of a platinum group metal to the substrate, diffusion of the platinum layer to form a region of diffusion, subsequent application of aluminum, and diffusion of the aluminum into the platinum-substrate diffusion region (column 2, lines 15-32 of Rose '578). The aluminum is applied in a concentration of from 1 to 15wt% (column 3, line 49).

Claims 1-4, 8-13, 16-19, and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rickerby et al. (EP 0718419).

Rickerby et al. teach a coating for superalloy articles, such as nickel-based turbine blades (page 2, line 4 and page 4, line 26). The coating comprises a platinum aluminide surface layer (22) interdiffused with the substrate composition (see Fig. 2A). A region is formed at the substrate surface by the diffusion comprising platinum, aluminum, and components of the substrate (see Fig. 2A). The aluminum content of the layer (22) is at least 8wt% while the platinum content is at least 25wt% (page 3, lines 13-14), with each element present to a decreasing extent through the depth of the layer (page 7, line 24). The layer (22) is formed by application of an aluminum-containing layer over a platinum layer. Platinising diffusion heat treatment frees aluminum from the aluminum-containing layer that rapidly migrates toward the platinum and creates platinum aluminide in combination with substrate materials (page 7, lines 19-25). The platinum layer may be diffused into the substrate prior to the subsequent diffusion of the

Art Unit: 1775

aluminum-containing layer (page 7, lines 41-44). The platinum aluminide layer (22), or "P" phase layer, exhibits good stability and reduces migration of elements between layers applied to the substrate (page 10, line 16).

Claims 1-4, 8-13, and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sangeeta (US Patent No. 6,395,406).

Sangeeta teaches an aluminum alloy-containing coating and method of its production for use with turbine engine components, such as turbine blades (column 2, lines 10-27 and column 6, lines 16-19). The coating is applied to a superalloy substrate such as a nickel-base alloys (column 5, lines 65-67). The coating is formed by mixing aluminum-containing slurry with at least one additional metal-containing slurry (column 3, lines 30-66). The first slurry contains from about 10 to about 70 wt% aluminum (column 3, lines 39-40). The second slurry may contain from about 20 to about 60 wt% platinum (column 4, lines 30-34) such that the final coating is a platinum aluminide (column 4, line 32). Following application to the substrate, the coating is subjected to diffusion heat treatment (column 7, lines 13-18) that inherently causes diffusion into the substrate. Thus a region is formed at the substrate surface by the diffusion comprising platinum, aluminum, and components of the substrate. The concentrations of aluminum and platinum will progressively decrease within the region due to the diffusion within the substrate to a point at which they are no longer present.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 18-29, 31-46, 48-51, and 52-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murphy (US Patent No. 5,716,720) in view of Sangeeta et al. (US Patent No. 6,485,780).

Murphy teaches a thermal barrier protected nickel based superalloy as described above.

Murphy does not specifically teach diffusion of aluminum subsequent to diffusion of platinum into the substrate.

Sangeeta et al. '780 teach diffusion of aluminum subsequent to diffusion of platinum into the substrate to form a platinum aluminide (column 7, lines 14-18; column 5, lines 55-58; column 3, lines 19-22). The diffusion process results in interdiffusion between aluminum, platinum, and the substrate (column 7, lines 63-65). Therefore, as Sangeeta et al. '780 clearly teach diffusion of aluminum subsequent to diffusion of platinum into the substrate provides the advantage of adjusting for the time required to form various aluminides for varying thicknesses of the diffusion layer (column 5, lines 58-63), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to form the coating taught by Murphy by diffusion of aluminum

Art Unit: 1775

subsequent to diffusion of platinum into the substrate as taught by Sangeeta et al. '780. Diffusion heat treatment inherently causes diffusion into the substrate such that the diffusion layer comprises platinum, aluminum, and components of the substrate. Thus the claimed invention as a whole is *prima facie* obvious over the combined teachings of the prior art.

Regarding claims 25-29, 31-46, 48-51, and 52-59, Murphy does not teach the aluminum content or platinum content as essentially constant in a zone comprising a specific percentage of a bounded region. As Murphy forms like materials in a like manner as claimed, it would therefore be expected that the diffusion coating will have the same characteristics claimed, particularly the aluminum content or platinum content will be essentially constant in a zone comprising a specific percentage of a bounded region overlapping that claimed, absent a showing of unexpected results. It has been held that where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or are produced by identical or a substantially identical processes, a *prima facie* case of either anticipation or obviousness will be considered to have been established over functional limitations that stem from the claimed structure. *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977), *In re Spada*, 15 USPQ2d 1655, 1658 ( Fed. Cir. 1990). The *prima facie* case can be rebutted by evidence showing that the prior art products do not necessarily possess the characteristics of the claimed products. *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977).

Claims 4-7, 13-15, 19-21, 25-29, 31-46, and 48-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rose et al. (US Patent No. 5,482,578), Rose et al. (US Patent No. 5,492,726), or Rose et al. (US Patent No. 5,843,588) in view of Murphy (US Patent No. 5,716,720).

The prior art references by Rose et al. teach a coating and process for its application as described above.

Rose et al. do not teach the percentage of platinum in the platinum group metal layer applied to the substrate. Further, Rose et al. do not teach the aluminum content or platinum content as essentially constant in a zone comprising a specific percentage of a bounded region.

Murphy teaches a platinum modified diffusion aluminide barrier wherein the amount of platinum is in the range of 8 to 35wt% (column 2, lines 32-36). Therefore, as Murphy clearly teaches a platinum-aluminum diffusion layer wherein the platinum content overlaps the claims provides the advantage of a diffusion barrier layer suitable for use in turbine engine components, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to apply the platinum layer taught by Rose et al. with a platinum content as taught by Murphy. Thus the claimed invention as a whole is *prima facie* obvious over the combined teachings of the prior art. Further, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to adjust the platinum content for the intended application, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).



Regarding claims 25-29, 31-46, and 48-59, as Rose et al. form like materials in a like manner as claimed and described in the specification, it would therefore be expected that the diffusion coating will have the same characteristics claimed, particularly the aluminum content or platinum content will be essentially constant in a zone comprising a specific percentage of a bounded region as claimed, absence a showing of unexpected results. It has been held that where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or are produced by identical or a substantially identical processes, a *prima facie* case of either anticipation or obviousness will be considered to have been established over functional limitations that stem from the claimed structure. *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977), *In re Spada*, 15 USPQ2d 1655, 1658 ( Fed. Cir. 1990). The *prima facie* case can be rebutted by evidence showing that the prior art products do not necessarily possess the characteristics of the claimed products. *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977).

Claims 5-7, 14-15, 20-21, 25-29, 31-46, and 48-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rickerby et al. (EP 0718419) in view of Rose et al. (US Patent No. 5,482,578), Rose et al. (US Patent No. 5,492,726), or Rose et al. (US Patent No. 5,843,588) in view of Murphy (US Patent No. 5,716,720).

Rickerby et al. teach a coating for superalloy articles as described above.

Rickerby et al. do not specifically teach the claimed percentage of platinum in the platinum group metal layer applied to the substrate nor do they teach the substrate as comprising more than 50% beta NiAl. Further, Rickerby et al. do not teach the

aluminum content or platinum content as essentially constant in a zone comprising a specific percentage of a bounded region.

Rickerby et al. teach the content of platinum as at least 25wt% as cited above. The amount of platinum is substantially close to that of the instant claims such that one of ordinary skill would have expected compositions that are in such close proportions to those in prior art to be *prima facie* obvious, and to have same properties. *Titanium Metals Corp.*, 227 USPQ 773 (CA FC 1985). Further, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to adjust the platinum content for the intended application, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

Rose et al. teach a coating and process for its application to substrates such as beta NiAl turbine blades (column 2, line 6 and column 4, line 15 of Rose '578). Therefore, as Rose et al. clearly teach a substrate of beta NiAl provides the advantage of use under extreme temperatures as a turbine blade, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to form the turbine blade of Rickerby et al. with a substrate comprising beta NiAl. Thus the claimed invention as a whole is *prima facie* obvious over the combined teachings of the prior art.

Regarding claims 25-29, 31-46, and 48-59, as Rickerby et al. form like materials in a like manner as claimed and described in the specification, it would therefore be expected that the diffusion coating will have the same characteristics claimed, particularly the aluminum content or platinum content will be essentially constant in a

Art Unit: 1775

zone comprising a specific percentage of a bounded region as claimed, absence a showing of unexpected results. It has been held that where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or are produced by identical or a substantially identical processes, a *prima facie* case of either anticipation or obviousness will be considered to have been established over functional limitations that stem from the claimed structure. *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977), *In re Spada*, 15 USPQ2d 1655, 1658 ( Fed. Cir. 1990). The *prima facie* case can be rebutted by evidence showing that the prior art products do not necessarily possess the characteristics of the claimed products. *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977).

Claims 1-6, 8-17, 18-29, 31-40, 42-46, 48, and 50-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sangeeta (US Patent No. 6,395,406) in view of Sangeeta et al. (US Patent No. 6,485,780).

Sangeeta '406 teaches an aluminum alloy containing coating and method of its production for use with turbine engine components as described above.

Sangeeta '406 does not specifically teach diffusion of aluminum subsequent to diffusion of platinum into the substrate. However, application of a layer of platinum followed by diffusion treatment of aluminum is taught as a known method of forming a platinum aluminide layer (column 1, lines 26-35). Further, in the alternative to the argument above, Sangeeta '406 does not specifically teach diffusion heat treatment inherently causes diffusion into the substrate such that the diffusion layer comprises platinum, aluminum, and components of the substrate.

Sangeeta et al. '780 teach diffusion of aluminum subsequent to diffusion of platinum into the substrate to form a platinum aluminide (column 7, lines 14-18; column 5, lines 55-58; column 3, lines 19-22). The diffusion process results in interdiffusion between aluminum, platinum, and the substrate (column 7, lines 63-65). Therefore, as Sangeeta et al. '780 clearly teach diffusion of aluminum subsequent to diffusion of platinum into the substrate provides the advantage of adjusting for the time and required to form various aluminides for varying thicknesses of the diffusion layer (column 5, lines 58-63), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to form the coating taught by Sangeeta '406 by diffusion of aluminum subsequent to diffusion of platinum into the substrate as taught by Sangeeta et al. '780. Diffusion heat treatment inherently causes diffusion into the substrate such that the diffusion layer comprises platinum, aluminum, and components of the substrate. Thus the claimed invention as a whole is *prima facie* obvious over the combined teachings of the prior art.

Regarding claims 5-6, 14-15, and 20-21, Sangeeta '406 teach the content of platinum as 20-60wt% as cited above. The amount of platinum is substantially close to that of the instant claims such that one of ordinary skill would have expected compositions that are in such close proportions to those in prior art to be *prima facie* obvious, and to have same properties. *Titanium Metals Corp.*, 227 USPQ 773 (CA FC 1985). Further, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to adjust the platinum content for the intended application, since it

Art Unit: 1775

has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

Regarding claims 25-29, 31-46, and 48-59, as Sangeeta '406, in view of Sangeeta et al. '780, form like materials in a like manner as claimed and described in the specification, it would therefore be expected that the diffusion coating will have the same characteristics claimed, particularly the aluminum content or platinum content will be essentially constant in a zone comprising a specific percentage of a bounded region as claimed, absence a showing of unexpected results. It has been held that where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or are produced by identical or a substantially identical processes, a *prima facie* case of either anticipation or obviousness will be considered to have been established over functional limitations that stem from the claimed structure. *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977), *In re Spada*, 15 USPQ2d 1655, 1658 ( Fed. Cir. 1990). The *prima facie* case can be rebutted by evidence showing that the prior art products do not necessarily possess the characteristics of the claimed products. *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430; 433 (CCPA 1977).

Claims 7, 41, and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sangeeta (US Patent No. 6,395,406) in view of Sangeeta et al. (US Patent No. 6,485,780), and further in view of in view of Rose et al. (US Patent No. 5,482,578), Rose et al. (US Patent No. 5,492,726), or Rose et al. (US Patent No. 5,843,588) in view of Murphy (US Patent No. 5,716,720).

Sangeeta '406, in view of Sangeeta '780, teaches an aluminum alloy containing coating and method of its production for use with turbine engine components as described above.

Sangeeta '406, in view of Sangeeta et al. '780, do not teach the substrate as comprising more than 50% beta NiAl.

Rose et al. teach a coating and process for its application to substrates such as beta NiAl turbine blades (column 2, line 6 and column 4, line 15 of Rose '578). Therefore, as Rose et al. clearly teach a substrate of beta NiAl provides the advantage of use under extreme temperatures as a turbine blade, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to form the turbine blade of Sangeeta '406, in view of Sangeeta et al. '780, with a substrate comprising beta NiAl.

Rose et al. do not teach the percentage of platinum in the platinum group metal layer applied to the substrate. Further, Rose et al. do not teach the aluminum content or platinum content as essentially constant in a zone comprising a specific percentage of a bounded region.

Murphy teaches a platinum modified diffusion aluminide barrier wherein the amount of platinum is in the range of 8 to 35wt% (column 2, lines 32-36). Therefore, as Murphy clearly teaches a platinum-aluminum diffusion layer wherein the platinum content overlaps the claims provides the advantage of a diffusion barrier layer suitable for use in turbine engine components, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to apply the platinum layer taught by

Art Unit: 1775

Rose et al. with a platinum content as taught by Murphy. Further, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to adjust the platinum content for the intended application, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

As to the percentage of beta NiAl, the amount of substrate (beta NiAl) present in the diffusion region is a function of time and temperature. "[W]here the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation." *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). In this case, the references do not specify the workable ranges for beta NiAl in the diffusion region, but they do describe the general conditions of the claim, namely the process of diffusion of like materials. It would not be inventive to discover the workable ranges by routine experimentation of the invention taught by the references.

The combined references form like materials in a like manner as claimed and described in the specification as set forth above. It would therefore be expected that the diffusion coating will have the same characteristics claimed, particularly the aluminum content or platinum content will be essentially constant in a zone comprising a specific percentage of a bounded region as claimed, absence a showing of unexpected results. It has been held that where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or are produced by identical or a substantially identical processes, a *prima facie* case of either anticipation or obviousness will be

considered to have been established over functional limitations that stem from the claimed structure. *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977), *In re Spada*, 15 USPQ2d 1655, 1658 ( Fed. Cir. 1990). The *prima facie* case can be rebutted by evidence showing that the prior art products do not necessarily possess the characteristics of the claimed products. *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977).

Thus the claimed invention as a whole is *prima facie* obvious over the combined teachings of the prior art.

Claims 1-29, 31-46, and 48-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,066,405 (Schaeffer), the cited prior art of record.

Schaeffer teaches a nickel-base superalloy substrate having an optimized platinum-aluminum diffused coating. The process of producing a diffused platinum-aluminum coating includes the steps of providing a nickel-base substrate (for example, a gas turbine component), depositing a platinum layer on the substrate, diffusing the platinum into the substrate, providing a source of aluminum, and diffusing the aluminum into the substrate. See Figure 3. Schaeffer states that the optimized platinum-aluminum diffusion coating contains about 18 weight percent platinum and about 18 weight percent aluminum, the balance of the coating composition being interdiffused components of the substrate (for example, nickel and chromium). Schaeffer teaches that the platinum, aluminum, and nickel concentrations in the coating region vary with the depth of the coating, and the specific compositions of surface regions are measured by an integration method. See line 13 in column 4 to line 7 in column 6. Therefore,



according to the teaching by Schaeffer regarding the measurement of specific compositions at various locations within a platinum-aluminum diffusion coating, it would be quite possible to optimize the coating process conditions for the purpose of obtaining particular platinum concentration profiles and aluminum concentration profiles at the surface of a substrate and within the platinum-aluminum diffusion coating. Also, the Examiner understands that applicants' claims require less than 18 weight percent of platinum and/or aluminum in the substrate surface region (for example, see claim 1), but the diffusion coating techniques utilized by Schaeffer will produce the same, lower platinum concentration and/or lower aluminum concentration within the diffusion coating being claimed by the applicants due to the gradient formed during diffusion.

Moreover, "less than 18 wt%" and a value of 17.99 wt% overlap with "about 18" wt%. Prior art which teaches a range within, overlapping, or touching the claimed range anticipates if the prior art range discloses the claimed range with sufficient specificity. See MPEP 2131.03 and Ex parte Lee, 31 USPQ2d 1105 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1993).

Schaeffer differs from the claims in that Schaeffer does not specify the particular platinum concentration profiles and aluminum concentration profiles that are possible at the surface of a substrate and within the platinum-aluminum diffusion coating.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have *optimized* the coating process conditions set forth by Schaeffer to such a degree or extent that particular platinum concentration profiles and particular aluminum concentration profiles are generated on a superalloy substrate when a platinum-aluminum diffusion coating is produced because Schaeffer provides

Art Unit: 1775

sufficient information about the useful process techniques and process conditions which can be controlled in the production of a platinum-aluminum diffusion coating. A person skilled in the art of diffusion metal coating systems would have been motivated to rely on Schaeffer because a result-effective variable (such as diffusion coating conditions and the amounts of platinum and aluminum in contact with a superalloy substrate) *can be optimized* by a skilled person in order to achieve a recognized result (such as particular platinum concentration profiles and particular aluminum concentration profiles at the substrate surface and in the platinum-aluminum diffusion coating). See In re Boesch, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). Generally, differences in concentration or temperature will not support the patentability of subject matter encompassed by the prior art unless there is evidence indicating such concentration or temperature is critical.

Further, the value of 17.99 wt% is substantially close to that of 18 wt% such that coatings containing each of the two values would be expected by one of ordinary skill in the art to act identically, absence a showing of unexpected results. In particular, the value of 18 wt% is substantially close to that of the instant claims such that one of ordinary skill would have expected compositions that are in such close proportions to those in prior art to be prima facie obvious, and to have same properties. *Titanium Metals Corp.*, 227 USPQ 773 (CA FC 1985). Still further, as Applicant has noted in the specification and prior responses that "the industrial standard for the content of the platinum and aluminum includes a variance of +/- 10%" and that the language of "essentially constant" includes this variance (page 19 of the Response dated June 7,

2005). Thus one forming the claimed invention, by Applicants' own account, would expect a variation of at least +/- 10% which encompasses the differences between the claims and Schaeffer. This variation may or may not include batch production variances and may or may not account for measurement variations that occur between samples, particularly when using more than one form of measurement. In short, the values are identical both in effectiveness and measurement. One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize this fact.

Regarding claims 25-29, 31-46, and 48-59, as Schaeffer forms like materials in a like manner as claimed and described in the specification, it would therefore be expected that the diffusion coating will have the same characteristics claimed, particularly the aluminum content or platinum content will be essentially constant in a zone comprising a specific percentage of a bounded region as claimed, absence a showing of unexpected results. It has been held that where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or are produced by identical or a substantially identical processes, a *prima facie* case of either anticipation or obviousness will be considered to have been established over functional limitations that stem from the claimed structure. *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977), *In re Spada*, 15 USPQ2d 1655, 1658 ( Fed. Cir. 1990). The *prima facie* case can be rebutted by evidence showing that the prior art products do not necessarily possess the characteristics of the claimed products. *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977).

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed May 4, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In particular, Applicant argues Murphy does not teach the claimed aluminum content is at a substrate surface region at the component surface. More particularly, the argument asserts that as the only layers in Murphy that meet the claimed requirement of "aluminum content less than 18 wt%" are interior layers, they are not surface layers as required by the language "at the component surface". This argument is not found to be convincing as a component has multiple surfaces. Therefore recitation of "at the component surface" does not limit the substrate surface region to an outermost position. Thus Murphy's teaching of a platinum-aluminum substrate surface region at a surface of the component meets the claim limitations.

Applicant further argues that the presence of the alumina layer and ceramic thermal barrier layer over the diffusion layer taught by Murphy is precluded by the claims. This argument is not found to be convincing as these layers are applied subsequent to the formation of the platinum-aluminum layer bond coat (column 5, lines 6-60). "Where the products produced by the reference process are neither transitory nor ephemeral but are by nature tangible and permanent pending the subsequent treatment to which they are subjected, Held that such products, though intermediate, in the reference, are anticipatory of the product defined by the claims on appeal." *Ex parte*

Art Unit: 1775

*Brinton*, 82 USPQ 112. Thus the claimed product is formed as disclosed by Murphy prior to application of the layers.

Still further, it is not clear that this argument is commensurate with the claims. As noted above, recitation of "at the component surface" does not limit the substrate surface region to an outermost position. Under this interpretation, Murphy's teaching of a platinum-aluminum substrate surface region at a surface of the component meets the claim limitations. Further, as "the component surface" may be interpreted to mean any component surface, Applicant's assertion that the substrate surface region is the outermost region of the component is incorrect in strictly interpreting the claim language. Thus the term "comprising" is interpreted to indicate further layers may be applied over the claimed substrate surface region.

Further, Applicant argues with respect to the Rose reference that it does not necessarily follow that starting with an aluminum source powder which is present in an amount between 1 to 15 wt% will result in an integrated aluminum content in the substrate surface region which is less than 18 wt% once diffused. The Examiner respectfully disagrees as the very nature of diffusion is a reduced content by weight of the layer components in the form of a gradient as they diffuse into the substrate. Therefore, Rose teaches a region having the claimed amount of aluminum when diffused into the substrate.

Applicant has failed to provide convincing evidence that Rose does not disclose a diffusion layer having aluminum in an amount overlapping the claims. While it is

Art Unit: 1775

recognized that factors such as temperature and time affect the rate of diffusion, this fails to show how Rose teaches the concentration of aluminum increases beyond the original amount by weight (1-15 wt.%) to exceed the claimed range (less than 18 wt. %). Absent such a showing, the Examiner maintains that the aluminum content does not increase beyond that of the starting materials and in fact a diffusion gradient forms resulting a region having the aluminum present in an amount overlapping the claims.

Moreover, Applicant argues Rickerby et al. teach the presence of the alumina layer and ceramic thermal barrier layer over the diffusion layer and is therefore precluded by the claims. This argument has been addressed above with respect to the Murphy reference and is applicable here as well. In particular, this argument is not found to be convincing as these layers are applied subsequent to the formation of the platinum-aluminum layer bond coat (abstract). "Where the products produced by the reference process are neither transitory nor ephemeral but are by nature tangible and permanent pending the subsequent treatment to which they are subjected, Held that such products, though intermediate, in the reference, are anticipatory of the product defined by the claims on appeal." *Ex parte Brinton*, 82 USPQ 112. Thus the claimed product is formed as disclosed by Rickerby prior to application of the layers. Therefore, Rickerby does teach a component with the requisite platinum-aluminum substrate surface region at the component surface as outlined above.

Even further, Applicant argues Sangeeta fails to teach a component with a platinum aluminum substrate surface region wherein the integrated aluminum content is the substrate surface region is less than 18 wt%. The Examiner respectfully disagrees as the very nature of diffusion is a reduced content by weight of the layer components in the form of a gradient as they diffuse into the substrate. Therefore, Sangeeta teaches a region having the claimed amount of aluminum when the slurry mix containing aluminum and platinum is diffused into the substrate.

As noted above with respect to the Rose reference, Applicant has failed to provide convincing evidence that Sangeeta does not disclose a diffusion layer having aluminum in an amount overlapping the claims. While it is recognized that factors such as temperature and time affect the rate of diffusion, this fails to show how Sangeeta teaches the concentration of aluminum increases beyond the original amount by weight (10-70 wt.%) to exceed the claimed range (less than 18 wt. %). Absent such a showing, the Examiner maintains that the aluminum content does not increase beyond that of the starting materials and in fact a diffusion gradient forms resulting a region having the aluminum present in an amount overlapping the claims.

Regarding the rejections over Murphy in view of Sangeeta, Applicant reasserts the argument that the claims preclude additional layers above the diffusion layer. This argument is addressed above with respect to the Murphy reference and the substance of that response applies here as well.

Applicant further argues that Murphy's disclosure of an aluminum content of about 18 to about 26 wt% teaches away from the claimed value of less than 18 wt%. However, "less than 18 wt%" is considered to overlap with "about 18" wt%. Prior art which teaches a range within, overlapping, or touching the claimed range anticipates if the prior art range discloses the claimed range with sufficient specificity. See MPEP 2131.03 and Ex parte Lee, 31 USPQ2d 1105 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1993).

Applicant further argues Sangeeta '780 does not indicate the amount of metals in the slurries they teach. However, Sangeeta '780 is not used in this rejection to teach the amounts slurry metals and instead is used to detail the obviousness of the order of steps taken (e.g., diffusing platinum prior to aluminum).

Regarding claims 25-29, 31-46, 48-51, and 52-59, Applicant argues the Examiner's conclusion that Murphy forms like materials in a like manner and it would therefore be expected that the diffusion coating will have the same characteristics claimed is based on a false premise, namely that the like materials are used in a like manner. However, Murphy in view of Sangeeta teaches all of the components and the method of their use in preparation of the claimed article as set forth above. Therefore, like materials are used in a like manner. Applicant has failed to rebut the *prima facie* case of obviousness set forth in the rejection by failing to establish how the claimed process of production is different from that of the prior art such that the composition is essentially constant in Applicant's claimed invention and not in the combination of Murphy in view of Sangeeta.



Regarding the rejections over the Rose references in view of Murphy, Applicant argues the layer structure of Murphy is precluded by the claims. However, Murphy is not used in this rejection to teach a layer structure and instead is used to detail the obviousness of using the platinum taught by the Rose et al. references in the amounts claimed.

Regarding claims 25-29, 31-46, and 48-59, Applicant argues the Examiner's conclusion that Rose et al. form like materials in a like manner and it would therefore be expected that the diffusion coating will have the same characteristics claimed is based on a false premise, namely that the like materials are used in a like manner. However, Rose et al. in view of Murphy teach all of the components and the method of their use in preparation of the claimed article as set forth above. Therefore, like materials are used in a like manner. Applicant has failed to rebut the *prima facie* case of obviousness set forth in the rejection by failing to establish how the claimed process of production is different from that of the prior art such that the composition is essentially constant in Applicant's claimed invention and not in the combination of Rose in view of Murphy.

Regarding the rejections over Rickerby in view of the Rose et al. references, and further in view of Murphy, Applicant reasserts the arguments with respect to the Rose and Murphy patents. The responses set forth above apply here as well.

Applicant also argues Rickerby et al. teach the presence of the alumina layer and ceramic thermal barrier layer over the diffusion layer and is therefore precluded by the claims. This argument is addressed above with respect to the Rickerby reference and

Art Unit: 1775

the substance of that response applies here as well. In particular, this argument is not found to be convincing as these layers are applied subsequent to the formation of the platinum-aluminum layer bond coat (abstract). "Where the products produced by the reference process are neither transitory nor ephemeral but are by nature tangible and permanent pending the subsequent treatment to which they are subjected, Held that such products, though intermediate, in the reference, are anticipatory of the product defined by the claims on appeal." *Ex parte Brinton*, 82 USPQ 112. Thus the claimed product is formed as disclosed by Rickerby prior to application of the layers. Therefore, Rickerby does teach a component with the requisite platinum-aluminum substrate surface region at the component surface as outlined above.

In addition, Applicant reasserts the argument that the references fail to teach the content as being essentially constant. However, Applicant has failed to rebut the *prima facie* case of obviousness set forth in the rejection by failing to establish how the claimed process of production is different from that of the prior art such that the composition is essentially constant in Applicant's claimed invention and not in the combination of Rose in view of Murphy.

Regarding the rejections over Sangeeta '406 in view of Sangeeta '780, Applicant argues Sangeeta '406 teaches a slurry for application to a substrate but does not teach the subsequent composition of the resulting coating. The Examiner respectfully disagrees as the very nature of diffusion is a reduced content by weight of the layer components in the form of a gradient as they diffuse into the substrate. Therefore,

Art Unit: 1775

Sangeeta teaches a region having the claimed amount of aluminum when the slurry mix containing aluminum and platinum is diffused into the substrate.

As noted above, Applicant has failed to provide convincing evidence that Sangeeta does not disclose a diffusion layer having aluminum in an amount overlapping the claims. While it is recognized that factors such as temperature and time affect the rate of diffusion, this fails to show how Sangeeta teaches the concentration of aluminum increases beyond the original amount by weight (10-70 wt.%) to exceed the claimed range (less than 18 wt. %). Absent such a showing, the Examiner maintains that the aluminum content does not increase beyond that of the starting materials and in fact a diffusion gradient forms resulting a region having the aluminum present in an amount overlapping the claims.

Regarding the rejections over Sangeeta '406 in view of Sangeeta '780, and further in view of Rose ('578, '796, '588) and Murphy, Applicant argues Sangeeta '406 teaches a slurry for application to a substrate but does not teach the subsequent composition of the resulting coating. The Examiner respectfully disagrees as the very nature of diffusion is a reduced content by weight of the layer components in the form of a gradient as they diffuse into the substrate. Therefore, Sangeeta teaches a region having the claimed amount of aluminum when the slurry mix containing aluminum and platinum is diffused into the substrate.

As noted above, Applicant has failed to provide convincing evidence that Sangeeta does not disclose a diffusion layer having aluminum in an amount overlapping

Art Unit: 1775

the claims. While it is recognized that factors such as temperature and time affect the rate of diffusion, this fails to show how Sangeeta teaches the concentration of aluminum increases beyond the original amount by weight (10-70 wt.%) to exceed the claimed range (less than 18 wt. %). Absent such a showing, the Examiner maintains that the aluminum content does not increase beyond that of the starting materials and in fact a diffusion gradient forms resulting a region having the aluminum present in an amount overlapping the claims.

Regarding claims 41 and 49, Applicant argues a zone having essentially constant content is not taught. However, the combined references form like materials in a like manner as claimed and described in the specification as set forth above. It would therefore be expected that the diffusion coating will have the same characteristics claimed, particularly the aluminum content or platinum content will be essentially constant in a zone comprising a specific percentage of a bounded region as claimed, absence a showing of unexpected results. It has been held that where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or are produced by identical or a substantially identical processes, a *prima facie* case of either anticipation or obviousness will be considered to have been established over functional limitations that stem from the claimed structure. *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977), *In re Spada*, 15 USPQ2d 1655, 1658 ( Fed. Cir. 1990). The *prima facie* case can be rebutted by evidence showing that the prior art products do not necessarily possess the characteristics of the claimed products. *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977). Applicant has failed to rebut the *prima facie* case of obviousness set forth in the

rejection by failing to establish how the claimed process of production is different from that of the prior art such that the composition is essentially constant in Applicant's claimed invention and not in the combination of references.

Applicant argues Schaeffer teaches away from the claimed ranges. Applicant provides a convincing argument, however the value of 17.99 wt% is substantially close to that of 18 wt% such that coatings containing each of the two values would be expected by one of ordinary skill in the art to act identically, absence a showing of unexpected results. In particular, the value of 18 wt% is substantially close to that of the instant claims such that one of ordinary skill would have expected compositions that are in such close proportions to those in prior art to be prima facie obvious, and to have same properties. *Titanium Metals Corp.*, 227 USPQ 773 (CA FC 1985).

Moreover, "less than 18 wt%" and a value of 17.99 wt% overlap with "about 18" wt%. Prior art which teaches a range within, overlapping, or touching the claimed range anticipates if the prior art range discloses the claimed range with sufficient specificity. See MPEP 2131.03 and *Ex parte Lee*, 31 USPQ2d 1105 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1993).

Further, as Applicant has noted in the specification and prior responses that "the industrial standard for the content of the platinum and aluminum includes a variance of +/- 10%" and that the language of "essentially constant" includes this variance (page 19 of the Response dated June 7, 2005). Thus one forming the claimed invention, by Applicants' own account, would expect a variation of at least +/- 10% which encompasses the differences between the claim and Schaeffer. This variation may or

may not include batch production variances and may or may not account for measurement variations that occur between samples, particularly when using more than one form of measurement. In short, the values are identical both in effectiveness and measurement. One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize this fact. The rejection based on obviousness is therefore maintained.

Applicant further argues Schaeffer does not teach a region of constant content of platinum or aluminum. "Schaeffer offers no teaching or suggestion as to how to achieve the constant content for any metal, as is required by the claims" (page 18 of the Response dated June 7, 2005). On the contrary, the method of formation taught by Schaeffer appears to be the same taught by Applicant: diffusion. Diffusion is a function of time and heat which effect the rate and extent of diffusion. As the specification does not appear to show any steps of formation outside of these factors, it must be assumed that the region of constant content is formed under the influence of time and heat alone. Applicant is requested to identify support that would indicate otherwise. Without such support, the products and method of production appear to be identical. It has been held that where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or are produced by identical or a substantially identical processes, a *prima facie* case of either anticipation or obviousness will be considered to have been established over functional limitations that stem from the claimed structure. *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977), *In re Spada*, 15 USPQ2d 1655, 1658 ( Fed. Cir. 1990). The *prima facie* case can be rebutted by evidence showing that the prior art products do not necessarily possess the characteristics of the claimed products. *In re*

Art Unit: 1775

*Best*, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977). Applicant has failed to provide such evidence.

The rejection based on obviousness is therefore maintained.


### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aaron S. Austin whose telephone number is (571) 272-8935. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday: 7:30 AM to 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jennifer McNeil can be reached on (571) 272-1540. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ASA



**JOHN J. ZIMMERMAN**  
PRIMARY EXAMINER